DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 281 283 EA 019 345

AUTHOR Campbell, Roald F.
TITLE Some Reflections about Writing "A History of Thought and Practice in Educational Administration."
PUB DATE Apr 87
NOTE 19p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Washington, DC, April 20-24, 1987).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Administrative Change; *Administrative Organization; Educational Administration; Educational History; Educational Research; *Educational Theories; Models; *Organizational Theories; Phenomenology; Qualitative Research; Research Needs; Research Utilization; Social Science Research; Systems Approach; *Theory Practice Relationship
IDENTIFIERS Historical Methods; Scientific Management; *Theory Development

ABSTRACT

A coauthor of a book on the history of thought and practice in educational administration reflects on issues raised during the writing of the book as follows: (1) Categories of administrative thought are difficult to establish. Two categories were derived from Richard Scott's rational systems approach--scientific management and bureaucracy. The categories of human relations and open systems emerged from terms that characterize widely held notions about administration. (2) Views characterized as scientific management and human relations were advocated in both organizational and educational literature. (3) There is a more complete record of administrative thought than of practice. Max Weber and others illustrate the evolution of administrataive thought. The paucity of documents concerning practice relates to American education as a local phenomenon. (4) There is some relationship between thought and practice. Conflicts over bureaucratic practices have required that schools move from closed to open systems. (5) Administrative thought has had the historical task of balancing organizational with individual concerns. (6) The most challenging new framework comes from the Canadians. Thomas Greenfield's phenomenological approach reinterpreted organizations as cultural artifacts. The ensuing debate brought a paradigm enlargement in the field of educational administration. Educational practices should be better recorded and the relationship between thought and practice should be more definitely determined. Three reference pages are appended. (CJH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

FD281283

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Roald F. Campbell

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

SOME REFLECTIONS ABOUT WRITING

A HISTORY OF THOUGHT AND PRACTICE IN EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION

Roald F. Campbell

University of Utah
Department of Educational Administration
339 Milton Bennion Hall
Salt Lake City, Utah 84112

Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Washington, D.C., April 20-24, 1987).

EA 019 345

SOME REFLECTIONS ABOUT WRITING

A HISTORY OF THOUGHT AND PRACTICE IN EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION

Roald F. Campbell

The book, A History of Thought and Practice in Educational Administration*, is, for me, the culmination of work begun in 1977. For the past decade, I have thought much about my own experience as a practitioner and a professor in the field, an experience that began some 60 years ago. Also, I have tried to take into account what others have said about the development of administrative thought and practice in education. As well, I have been fortunate in finding three colleagues--Thomas Fleming, Jackson Newell, and John Bennion--each with different orientations but all with interest and background in the history of the field, who have joined me in continued dialogue and have become co-authors. I owe these colleagues much but I do not hold them responsible for the thoughts I offer here.

Instead of attempting to summarize A History of Thought and Practice in Educational Administration, I have chosen to set forth reflections growing out of our experience in writing the book. A number of the issues we faced will be revealed and at least some of the content of the volume will be suggested. Let us turn to those reflections.

1. Categories of administrative thought are difficult to establish. In 1958, March and Simon dealt with the matter when they said "We can distinguish two main lines of development in traditional organization theory" (1958, p. 12). They saw the first line as deriving from the work of Frederick Taylor and the second from the work of L. H. Gulick and L. Urwick. In their discussion of organizations, however, a number of other modes of thought were

*Available from Teachers College Press, 1987.

considered including theories of bureaucracy, the general model of employee participation, and the cognitive limits of rationality.

A number of other students of organizations have divided administrative thought into scientific management, largely stemming from Taylor, and human relations, fathered by Elton Mayo and his colleagues. Getzels and others, for instance, accepted the scientific management and human relations categories and then suggested that the third approach invoked the use of the social sciences (1968, pp. 39-51). Jack Culbertson, in his recent work, has divided the quest for a science of management, beginning in 1875, into five periods each characterized by a different perception of science (1987). He makes use of concepts related to scientific management, human relations, and what he terms the theory movement but his first period precedes scientific management and his fifth period is concerned with "Administrative Science as an Embattled Concept."

In our own case, we established four broad categories that seemed to encompass administrative thought over this century and around which our book is organized. In deciding upon these broad categories, we took account of the major views developed by others in the field. We particularly noted the work of James March and Herbert Simon in Organizations, 1958; Nicos Mouzelis in Organizations and Bureaucracy, 1967; Jacob Getzels and others in Educational Administration as a Social Process, 1968; Charles Perrow in Complex Organizations, second edition, 1970; and Richard Scott in Organizations: Rational, Natural, and Open Systems, 1981. While we followed precisely none of the classifications offered by these scholars, we were impressed with the three major systems set forth by Scott. Even here, however, we divided his rational system into two major views: scientific management and bureaucracy.

Treatments of bureaucracy by Mouzelis and Perrow gave support to such a division.

In examining the work of other scholars, we attempted to apply certain criteria. We thought that we needed broad views that encompassed related theories and the work of several contributors. In each of these broad views we sought a term that seemed to characterize the notion of administration that held center stage for some period of time. It was our hope that the major views formulated would have considerable face validity with many scholars and practitioners in the field. We also desired to use major views that were useful in terms of organizing administrative thought and practice. Finally, we recognized that categorizations are always a matter of judgment. As you can see, we struggled with the categories but finally settled on scientific management, human relations, bureaucracy, and open systems as the major rubrics.

2. Versions of thought characterized as scientific management and human relations were advocated by scholars in both organizational and educational literature. While it is true that major ideas about organizations have often originated outside of education and have then been transmitted to education, we should note that with respect to both scientific management and human relations there were concurrent streams of thinking in the general organizational literature and in the educational literature. Taylor obviously dominated the organizational literature during the early decades of this century (1911). He also had a ready disciple in Franklin Bobbitt who quickly applied Taylor's thinking to school systems (1913).

But quite independent of Taylor was the testing movement largely indigenous to education. Edward Thorndike at Teachers College who is reputed

to have said, "that if a thing exists it exists in quantity and if it exists in quantity it can be measured" served as the godfather to the testing movement (1904). The impetus given by Thorndike set both test makers and administrators in action. For instance, S. A. Courtis developed a series of standardized arithmetic tests (1916). Very shortly, Frank Spaulding, then superintendent of the Newton, Massachusetts schools, began using standardized tests to determine the efficiency of the Newton schools (1913).

Not only did Spaulding find standardized tests a useful tool in his own schools but he urged his fellow superintendents to follow his example. Nor was Spaulding alone in his advocacy of this new practice. Those who espoused scientific management whether Taylor or his disciples with time and motion studies in industry or Thorndike and his followers with measurement in education, urged that the new doctrine be put into practice. Scholars were not loath in telling administrators whether in industry or education what they ought to do.

Turning to human relations, we find again that such a view was set forth by scholars in both organizational and educational arenas. Elton Mayo and his colleagues, for instance, left us a rather complete record of their work with the employees of Western Electric (1933). But even before Mayo there was John Dewey setting forth his ideas about democracy in education (1916).

To be sure, human relations in industry and democratic administration in education are not identical concepts. Human relations grew out of industrial research. On the other hand, democratic administration provided a way of bringing organizational practices in schools in line with long standing political and social values. Human relations was empirical and pragmatic, while democratic administration was historical and philosophic. In terms of

implementation, however, the two ideas tended to converge in advocating greater participation of organization members in decisions affecting them.

Thus, as in scientific management, we have two related approaches to administrative thought, human relations and democratic administration one emanating essentially from industry and the other essentially in education. Each of these streams of thought was found rather compatible to the other and those who developed these views urged that they be practiced by both industrial and educational managers.

3. There is a more complete record of administrative thought than of administrative practice. As noted above, examples of concepts pertaining to scientific management are set forth by Taylor and Bobbitt; concepts in human relations by Mayo and Dewey. With respect to bureaucracy Max Weber was obviously the seminal thinker (Gerth and Mills, 1948). While the transition of bureaucratic thinking to education is not quite as clear, James Anderson did provide one such link (1968). If open systems be interpreted broadly, documentation for that view can be found in David Easton (1965). A related concept, as applied to education, is set forth by Karl Weick (1976).

These and other examples permit us to see rather clearly the evolution of administrative thought. With respect to administrative practice, however, there is not a corresponding set of documents. There are understandable reasons for this relative paucity of evidence. Educational practice in the United States has been very much a local phenomenon. There are thousands of school districts and they vary greatly in terms of size, cultural composition, financial resources, and administrative outlook. In each of these districts there are from one to hundreds of school attendance areas and these, too, often vary in many ways. These school and district variations prevent

formulation of any homogeneous administrative practice in American education. Also, most practitioners, unlike most scholars, do not leave descriptions of their practices and those who do often have difficulty in being objective in such reports.

While not as plentiful as one might hope, there are some records of administrative practice. One of the better reports regarding scientific management in practice came from Hollis Caswell (1929). He identified 181 studies or surveys of city school systems between 1910 and 1927. In 34 of the 50 surveys studied most carefully specific changes had been made in the curriculum programs of the school systems, most of them attributable to the surveys. Incidentally, the survey movement itself was another manifestation of scientific management and recommendations made in these surveys tended to reflect the scientific management position.

One of the better studies on teacher participation was conducted by Wilber Moser (1939). He differentiated among four types of participation ranging from complete cooperation (Type I) at one end of the scale and complete administration autonomy (Type IV) at the other end and asked teachers and administrators in over one hundred California school districts to rate levels of teacher participation in ten areas of decision making. While Moser found that perceptions of teachers and administrators varied in amount of participation, both agreed that democratic administration was being attempted in many school systems.

For decades there have been general observations about school systems being organized as bureaucracies. James Anderson decided to examine empirically the extent to which school practices in the junior high schools of Baltimore were bureaucratic in nature. Interestingly enough, Anderson (1968,

p. XI) reported that: "Contrary to expectations, rules appear to mediate authority conflict, making the imposition of hierarchical authority more tolerable to professionals." Anderson (1968, P. XI) also suggested that: "In education rules may be particularly necessary because of the lack of accepted performance measures, difficulty in effectively supervising instruction, and varying degrees of professional competence among teachers trained in the various disciplines."

Bureaucracy was essentially a closed system as, indeed, were democratic administration and scientific management, concepts which prevailed earlier. But closed systems were no longer acceptable. Social changes in recent decades impinged upon organizations, particularly public organizations. The Brown decision, civil rights legislation, the student revolt, and the women's rights movement, had direct and long-term impact on the schools. If thought was to reflect reality, it became clear that environmental, or forces external to the organization, as well as those internal to the organization had to be taken into account in any concept designed to explain organizational behavior. Thus, with or without explicit recognition on the part of many practitioners and scholars, the open systems view of administration became a prominent administrative framework in the 1970s. Clearly, administrators in schools and school districts were forced to give increasing attention to members of their organizations and to concerned people outside their organizations, a condition set forth dramatically by Cuban in Urban School Chiefs Under Fire, (1976).

Thus, we see that there is some evidence regarding the nature of administrative practice over the years. The evidence comes from school surveys, empirical studies of practices in some school systems, from case studies of a few school administrators, and from other sources. In many of

these studies the investigator had to rely on what teachers and administrators reported as practice. There are few records of actual observations of practice by competent observers.

4. While the evidence is somewhat tentative, there is some relationship between thought and practice. With respect to scientific management, school administrators during the early part of the century were impressed by the movement and many of them tried to make their schools more efficient, particularly through the use of standardized tests and school surveys. Regarding democratic administration, administrators perceived more participation in decision making than did teachers but both saw participation. One has to acknowledge that most of the case studies, reporting successful democratic practices, were done in smaller, suburban districts where interpersonal relations were more easily maintained. Bureaucracy seems to have crept into school systems much as it did in business and government; a convenient response to growth in organizational size and complexity. While most schools exhibited elements of bureaucratic practice, the conflict between such practice and the growing professionalism of teachers required some modification of bureaucracy in schools. In open systems, much like bureaucracy, practice may have preceded theory. The growing power of teachers internally, and the growing concern of parents and others externally, required that schools move from closed to open systems, even though in some cases reluctantly.

As each view of administration came to center stage, many school administrators reflected, explicitly or implicitly, such a view in their practice. There seem to be plausible reasons why there was not more congruence between thought and practice. Each view of administration has been

limited and incomplete. Each view appears to have some relevance for particular problems, particular places, with particular personnel, and for a particular stage of an organization's life. None of the views set forth depicts reality adequately. Perhaps the other side of this same point is that administrators by the very nature of their jobs deal with practical problems and not with theoretical niceties.

5. Old formulations never go away--they retreat from center stage and reappear in new dress. For our purpose here, we might collapse scientific management and bureaucracy as both focused on task achievement in the organization. We might also collapse human relations and open systems as both paying more attention to the people in the organization. This permits us to observe that over this entire century administrative thought has had the persistent task of balancing concerns with the organization and concerns with the individual. On one hand organizational efficiency seems to demand structure and direction, on the other hand individual satisfaction seems to demand participation and discretion.

A number of contributors to administrative thought have noted these dual concerns and have rejected a single approach to organizational behavior. Notable among these scholars were Chester Barnard and Chris Argyris in the general organizational literature; Barnard with his concepts of effectiveness and efficiency and Argyris with his concerns about organization and personality. In the literature on educational administration, Jacob Getzels, Egon Guba, and Andrew Halpin where the notable contributors; Getzels and Guba with their normative and personal dimensions and Halpin with his structure and consideration concepts. While the concepts set forth in each of the four

formulations were not identical, in each case attention was paid to the organization on one hand and the individual on the other.

But what about the persistence of these concepts? With respect to organizational concerns, particularly as found in scientific management, Thomas James noted in his prescient lecture, The New Cult of Efficiency in Education, the reincarnation of Taylorism (1969). James was obviously making reference to the earlier work of Raymond Callahan in which the scientific management movement in education was set forth (1962). President Johnson became infatuated with the planning, programming, and budgeting formula (PPBS) and in his famous executive order, under date of October 12, 1965, ordered all departments of the federal government to implement such a program (Knezevich, 1973, p. 14). It was not long until educational agencies even at the state and local levels were attempting to follow suite.

The examples having to do with the recurrence of concepts focusing on the person or human relations are even more numerous. One of the more recent is to be found in the work of Thomas Peters and Robert Waterman, In Search of Excellence (1982). After an examination of 43 "best-run" American companies, the authors set forth eight attributes that seem to distinguish these organizations. Some of these attributes are a bias for action, close to the customer, and productivity through people. Peters and Waterman acknowledge their indebtedness to Mayo for his insistence on "attention to employees." In a sense, their main thrust is a new interpretation of the human relations approach.

The fact that organization and person concerns recur would seem to suggest a certain validity to both approaches. Moreover, it seems likely that the appropriateness of each approach may depend on the problem at hand. For

some problems the organizational or task approach may be most effective; for other problems the person or human relations approach may be most effective. Keeping the two approaches in appropriate balance does seem to be the persistent task.

6. The most challenging new framework comes from the Canadians. As one reflects upon the four major approaches to administrative thought set forth in our book and recognizes that these approaches often recycle in new dress, he might well ask what next? We have no definitive answer to that question. One answer has been suggested by a number of Canadian scholars. Robin Farquhar appears to have been the first to set forth what might be called the Canadian position. In "The Humanities in Preparing Educational Administrators" he contended that leaders should be able to consider the "oughts" as well as the is's (1970, p. 3). As some have said, however, it remained for Thomas Greenfield to fire "a shot at the theory movement which was heard around the world." Greenfield (1975) challenged many of the assumptions held by people in the field. His paper "Theory About Organizations: A New Perspective and Its Implications for Schools", was presented to an international audience in 1974. Greenfield argued "an alternative view which sees organizations not as structures subject to universal laws but as cultural artifacts dependent upon the specific meaning and intention of people within them" (p. 74). Instead of the scientific paradigm, borrowed from the physical sciences, he advocated a phenomenological approach to the study of organizations. Instead of quantitative studies, Greenfield contended that, "the case study and comparative and historical methods become the preferred means of analysis" (p. 85). Daniel Griffiths (1979) challenged Greenfield's interpretation of the matter but did suggest

that there was "intellectual turmoil in educational administration". Christopher Hodgkinson (1982, p. 66) noted, perhaps with some lack of modesty, "a certain philosophical-ethical thrust integral to the Canadian endeavour in educational administration which...is unparalleled in the United States". Unparalleled or not, the ferment has been such as to cause Culbertson (1987), in his historical treatment of the field, to entitle the last section of his paper, "Administrative Science as an Embattled Concept: 1967-1985".

But the debate has not ended in chaos. Norman Boyan (1981, p. 12) in his survey of research in the field found no, "new single paradigm to guide research across the entire territory or even within any of the several specializations". Donald Willower, after surveying a number of developments in the field, concluded that,

> ...positivism is an inadequate philosophy, but it has some key strengths including its emphasis on meaning. This emphasis provides the theorist-researcher with two crucial questions. The first is "What operations did you actually carry out in your research to define the concepts you employed?" The second is "What is the logical structure of the explanation for what was observed?" We cannot afford to ignore either of these questions (1982, p. 13)

One of the more succinct and reasonable treatments of the matter has been offered by Egon Guba and Yvonna Lincoln (1981, p. 77) who suggest that the two paradigms can be complementary; "there is no reason why both camps should not exploit both quantitative and qualitative techniques, should not be concerned with relevance and rigor...grounded theory as well as flashes of insight... verification and discovery"...Instead of a paradigm shift, there appears to be a paradigm enlargement emerging in educational administration.

Let me conclude by making a confession and expressing some hopes for the future. As to the confession, I came away from this project with a much greater respect for historical research. While I have always been prone to

deal with the context in which events occur and thus to invoke the historical method to some extent, in writing this book we were faced with the task of actually documenting the major developments in our field. In any such work there must be some selection of events. Our biases probably played a part in that selection. Even so, we tried hard to document rather fully what happened in thought and practice, give only reasoned interpretation of that evidence, and to keep our advocacy in check. Others may find our efforts inadequate but we will be pleased if we have delineated a point of beginning in depicting our history.

Now as to the hopes. To begin with I hope we can find ways of keeping better records of practice. Many documents now dealing with past practice are statements of intention. Often they are records of speeches of superintendents about what they plan to do. Or, they are writings of professors about what ought to be done. While such statements have a place, they do not tell us what actually was done. More helpful than declarations of intent or advocacy are those studies in which the perceptions of actors near the scene are reported. Even more useful, would be actual records of observations made by competent observers, of which there are very few. Many observations of actual practice in administration are being made every day. How enlightening it would be if a few of those observers would leave us a record of their observation notes! Or better still, fame awaits any principal or superintendent who will organize such notes, perhaps after retirement, into a readable document.

Another hope, and perhaps this is the erstwhile practitioner showing through; I hope that more adequately than in the past, ways will be found to extend thought about administration to the implications of such thought or

theory for research and for practice. I hope that some of those who conceptualize will have more concern about the extension or implications of their ideas. Indeed, I think theory cannot be seen as useful without such testing. It may be that some who are good at conceptualizing are not by disposition or circumstance in a position to test their notions by way of research or practice. In such cases, I hope that others in our profession who detect possible merit in such ideas will see that they are submitted to empirical testing.

In short, I hope that future historians of our field will find our thought is more adequately set forth and tested, that our practices are more fully recorded, and that the relationship between thought and practice can be more definitively determined.

REFERENCES

Anderson, J. C. (1968). Bureaucracy in Education. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Argyris, C. (1957). Personality and Organization. New York: Harper & Row.

Barnard, C. I. (1938). The Functions of the Executive. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Bobbitt, F. (1913). "Some General Principles of Management Applied to the Problem of City School Systems," in The Supervision of City Schools: Twelfth Yearbook of the National Society of Education. Part I, Bloomington, Ill.: Public School Publishing Co.

Boyan, N. (1981). "Follow the Leader: Commentary on Research in Educational Administration," Educational Researcher. 10(February 1981) 6-13 & 21.

Callahan, R. E. (1965). Education and the Cult of Efficiency. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Caswell, H. L. (1929). City School Surveys. New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University.

Courtis, S. A. (1916). "Courtis Tests in Arithmetic: Value to Superintendents and Teachers," in Standards and Tests for Measurement of the Efficiency of Schools and School Systems: Fifteenth Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education. Part I, Bloomington, Ill.: Public School Publishing Co.

Cuban, L. (1976). Urban School Chiefs Under Fire. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Culbertson, J. (1987). "A Centuries Quest for a Knowledge Base," in Boyan, N. J. Handbook on Educational Administration. Washington, D.C.: American Educational Research Association, pages _____.

Dewey, J. (1916). Democracy and Education. New York: MacMillan.

Easton, D. (1965). A Framework for Political Analysis. New York: Prentice-Hall.

Farquhar, R. H., (1970). The Humanities in Preparing Educational Administrators. (State of the Knowledge Series, Number Seven), University of Oregon: The ERIC Clearning House on Educational Administration.

Gerth, H. H. and Mills, C. W. (eds) (1948). From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Getzels, J. W. and Guba, E. G. (1957). "Social Behavior and the Administrative Process," School Review. 65(Winter, 1957) 423-441.

Getzels, J. W., Lipham, J. M., and Campbell, R. F. (1968). Educational Administration as a Social Process. New York: Harper & Row.

Greenfield, T. B. (1975). "Theory About Organizations: A New Perspective and Its Implications for Schools," in Meredydd Hughes, Administering Education--International Challenge. London: The Athone Press, ch. 5.

Griffiths, D. E. (1979). "Intellectual Turmoil in Educational Administration," Educational Administration Quarterly. 15(Fall 1979) 43-65.

Guba, E. G. and Lincoln, Y. S. (1981). Effective Evaluation. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Gulick, L. and Urwick, L. (1937). Papers on the Science of Administration. New York: Institute of Public Administration.

Halpin, A. W. (1956). The Leadership Behavior of School Superintendents. SCDS Monograph #4, Columbus, Ohio: College of Education, The Ohio State University.

Hodgkinson, C., (1982). "Educational Administration in Canada: A Conspectus", School Organization and Administrativer Abstracts. V. X, No. 2.

James, H. T. (1969). The New Cult of Educational Efficiency. Pittsburgh: The University of Pittsburgh Press.

Knezevich, S. J. (1973). Program Budgeting. Berkeley, California: McCutchan Publishing Co.

March, J. G. and Simon, H. A. (1958). Organizations. New York: John Wiley and Sons.

Mayo, E. (1933). The Human Problems of an Industrial Civilization. New York: MacMillan.

Moser, W. E. (1939). "Do Teachers Help Run the Schools?" The Nation's Schools. 23(January 1939) 50-52.

Mouzelis, N. P. (1967). Organization and Bureaucracy. Chicago: Aldine Publishing Co.

Perrow, C. (1979). Complex Organizations. 2nd ed., Glenview, Ill.: Scott Foresman.

Peters, T. J. and Waterman, R. H., Jr. (1982). In Search of Excellence. New York: Harper & Row.

Scott, W. R. (1981). Organizations--Rational, Natural, and Open Systems. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall.

Spaulding, F. E. (1913). "The Application of the Principles of Scientific Management," in Journal of Proceedings and Addresses, National Education Association, 51st Annual Meeting, pages 259-279.

Taylor, F. W. (1911). The Principles of Scientific Management. New York: Harper.

Thorndike, E. L. (1904). An Introduction to the Theory of Mental and Social Measurements. New York: Science Press.

Weick, K. E. (1976). "Educational Organizations as Loosely Coupled Systems," Administrative Science Quarterly. 2(March) 1976, pages 1-19.

Willower, D. J. (1982). "Some 'Yes, Buts' and Educational Administration," paper presented at UCEA Conference, May 1982.